

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 21 July 2009 have been fully considered. Arguments against the 101 rejections are moot because those rejections are withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments. Arguments against the 103 rejections using the previous combination are moot in view of the new combination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9-11, 13, 14, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 1182874 A1 ("Leporini") in view of US 7,249,379 B2 ("Larsen")

Claim 1: Leporini discloses a method of recording (para. 0103) and/or playback (paras. 0001, 0002) of recorded interactive television (para. 0021) on a set top box. The set top box uses conditional access information (para. 0016, 0025) to control access to content. Content is obtained and accessed by

Art Unit: 2427

interactive applications (paras. 0133, 0134). However, Leporini does not further teach the claimed method of controlling applications' access to content.

Larsen teaches a security method for controlling access to content for a computer having a number of applications or processes (col. 2, lls. 30–33). The access control is based on a process (col. 4, lls. 22–24) so that a process can only access content in a manner permitted by a resource access table (col. 4, lls. 54–59). Thus a payroll application may be the only application that can delete or modify its database (col. 4, lls. 28–32), although the database is still capable of being accessed by other applications (col. 4, lls. 35–38). The resource access table comprises file identification information in association with application identification information (e.g., the payroll application would be identified as a process and associated with the payroll database file and the access rights; see col. 5, table 1).

One of ordinary skill, following Larsen's teaching, would have found it obvious to modify Leporini's recording application to incorporate the process-based security system, and further to restrict access to recorded content so that only the recording application can modify or delete its recorded content, the content still capable of being accessed by other applications. The combination would have been obvious for the purpose of further controlling access so that content may only be used as intended (see Larsen, col. 2, lls. 1–7).

The resource access table of Leporini in view of Larsen would then contain an access control entry tagging the recorded content as well as the

Art Unit: 2427

recording application and the access rights (see col. 5, table 1) in order to carry out the above security configuration.

Claim 2: Leporini further teaches that said interactive television content is audio/visual content associated to said interactive television application (paras. 0133, 0134).

Claim 6: Leporini in view of Larsen further teaches indicating to a play-back application for playing back interactive television content which other interactive television content stored on a storage medium is related to said play-back application by means of said identification information (see Larsen col. 5, table 1: each process may be associated with multiple content resources. So a resource access table specifying rights for a playback application would list all the content resources for that program and thus identify which other content is related to the application).

Claim 7: Leporini in view of Larsen further teaches said play-back application allowing a user to navigate between a plurality of said stored related interactive television content (either in conjunction with the program guide, Leporini para. 0134, or through sequential playback of related sections of a single content, Leporini para. 0175).

Claim 9: Leporini further teaches that said interactive television content is recorded as files (para. 0032).

Claim 10: Leporini in view of Larsen further teaches storing said interactive television content, said interactive television application and said identification information in separate files (Leporini para. 0032; note also that the

Art Unit: 2427

resource table, Larsen col. 5, is a separate collection of information so it is stored in its own separate file).

Claim 11: Leporini in view of Larsen further teaches that said identification information is stored in an info file being linked to at least one interactive television application (the resource access table, Larsen col. 5, is linked to the application by the application identification information within the entry), said info file comprising a table with related interactive television content to said interactive television application on said storage medium (see Larsen, col. 5, table 1).

Claim 13: Leporini further teaches said interactive television content being at least one audio/visual stream (e.g., a game; paras. 0345, 0149).

Claim 14: Leporini in view of Larsen, as combined for the claim 1 rejection, further teaches a computer-readable medium with a computer program comprising a code segment for carrying out the method of claim 1 (Leporini para. 0001).

Claim 17: Leporini in view of Larsen, as combined for the claim 1 rejection, further teaches an apparatus for implementing the method of claim 1, the apparatus further comprising a memory for storing interactive television content (Leporini para. 0103) and a central processing unit (Leporini para. 0001).

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leporini in view of Larsen and US 6505160 B1 (“Levy”).

Claim 5: Leporini in view of Larsen does not further teach said identification information being information identifying a broadcaster who

Art Unit: 2427

broadcast said application and said recorded interactive television content for recording.

Levy discloses a method of identifying broadcast information comprising identifying the information by a broadcaster identifier (col. 3, lls. 24–33).

It is obvious to combine known elements according to known methods to yield predictable results. Therefore, it would have been obvious to include the broadcast identifier in the identification information of Leporini in view of Larsen according to its known method for identifying objects, the predictable result being a better or more complete identification of the information.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leporini (EP 1182874 A1) in view of Applicant's admitted prior art ("AAPA").

Claim 12: Leporini in view of Lambert does not further disclose the method according to claim 1, wherein said interactive television is MHP.

AAPA discloses that MHP was a well-known standard for interactive television (Applicant's spec. pg. 1, lls. 1-11.)

It would have been obvious to have modified the interactive television method of Leporini to conform to the MHP standard for the purpose of using a popular interactive television standard (Applicant's spec. pg. 1, lls. 1-11), thus ensuring compatibility with other devices.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bennett Ingvoldstad whose telephone number is (571) 270-3431. The examiner can normally be reached on M–F 9–5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Scott Beliveau can be reached on (571) 272-7343. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2427

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Bennett Ingvaldstad/
Examiner, Art Unit 2427

/Scott Beliveau/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2427